

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 13, 14, 16, and 17 are now pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

Amendment

The specification has been amended to correct a typographical error.

Claims 18 and 19 have been canceled, and claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 13, and 16 have been amended to improve their form and clarity. Independent claims 1 and 8 further have been amended to define the power supply unit and more clearly define the power supply control unit. Claims 1 and 8 further have been amended to remove the informalities identified by the examiner and to overcome the § 112 rejection. The claims now recite only a single display unit associated with the external device. Claim 1 now recites a communication control unit that provides the receiving and transmitting functions.

No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 13, 14, 16, and 17 now stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Iida (USP 6,785,023) in view of Chang (USP 6,507,273). Applicant traverses this rejection because the combination would not have disclosed or taught controlling power supply to at least one of the devices required for operating at least one function indicated by the received information from an external apparatus.

Independent claims 1 and 8 call for, *inter alia*, 1) generating a file including first information that causes a display unit of an external apparatus to display setting information for setting at least the power status of a plurality of functions and second information that causes the display unit to display setting information for setting at least power status of the plurality of functions, and 2) controlling a power supply unit, which supplies power to at least one of the devices composing the image processing apparatus, to supply power to at least one of the devices required for at least one function indicated by the received information from the external apparatus. Accordingly, it is possible for an information processing apparatus having a plurality of functions to control the power supply to the individual devices required for the plurality of functions, based on the information set by an external apparatus.

Iida discloses a network facsimile apparatus that generates a file that causes a display unit of an external apparatus to display the power status information. The file disclosed in Iida includes setting information for setting the network facsimile apparatus for example. Iida's setting information, however, does not include information for controlling power supply of the network facsimile apparatus, as recognized by the examiner. In this respect, the examiner relied upon Chang for the proposition that using setting information for remotely controlling the power supply of a device would have been obvious. Applicant disagrees for the following reasons.

Chang discloses remotely controlling turning ON and OFF of a power source 91 to an electrically powered system 90 from a remote PC 30. The PC is connected to a power switch device 100 via a network. The power switch device 100 turns ON and OFF the power supply of the power source 91 to the entire powered system 90, based on the instructions from the PC 30. Chang would not have disclosed or taught selectively supplying power supply to different devices associated with the plurality of functions. That is, Chang teaches turning ON or OFF the entire power system such as an information processing apparatus, rather than supplying power only to the component needed to operate the desired function.

As presently claimed, the information processing apparatus controls power supply to at least one of a plurality of devices required for at least one function selected by an external apparatus. That is, the information processing apparatus does not turn ON and OFF the power supply of the entire information processing apparatus. Chang would not have taught selectively supplying power to operate at least one selected function among many provided by the electrically powered system from the same power source. Accordingly, applicant submits that, even if the combination were deemed properly combinable for argument's sake, the combination would not have taught the invention set forth in claims 1 and 8.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that the pending claims patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

09 NOVEMBER 2006

DATE

/Lyle Kimms/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826
ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826
703-726-6020 (PHONE)
703-726-6024 (FAX)